



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/502,080	10/08/2004	J. Phillip Bowen	B40-002	3420
28156 7590 10/31/2007 COLEMAN SUDOL SAPONE, P.C. 714 COLORADO AVENUE BRIDGE PORT, CT 06605-1601			EXAMINER KUDLA, JOSEPH S	
			ART UNIT 4133	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/31/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/502,080	Applicant(s) BOWEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Joseph S. Kudla	Art Unit 4133	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 15, 22, 23 and 29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 15, 22, 23 and 29 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-7, 8 and 15, drawn to a composition of a pharmaceutical composition and a method of treating a tumor or cancer in a patient comprising administering a pharmaceutical composition.

Group II, claim(s) 22-23 and 29, drawn to a method of treating an angiogenic disorder in a patient comprising administering a pharmaceutical composition.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I-II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: There is no special technical feature in the instant claim set.

The technical feature that applicant states in Group I is a pharmaceutical composition and a method of treating a tumor or cancer in a patient comprising

administering a pharmaceutical composition. Group II discloses a method of treating an angiogenic disorder in a patient comprising administering a pharmaceutical composition. In the inventions in Groups I and II, the compound is purported by

Applicant in the instant disclosure to actively treat two patently distinct diseases/disorders. For example in Group 1, for a type of cancer, such as breast cancer, the ultimate interaction of a therapeutic drug would be to control proliferation or selectively kill the cancerous cell. And for example in Group II, for a type of angiogenic disorder, such as acne, the ultimate interaction of a therapeutic drug would be to act as a bactericidal, an antibiotic, a hormone or a retinoid depending on the condition being addressed. Because the methods in Group I and II actively treat a disease/disorder via separate modes of action and the therapeutic agent is used to elicit a different effect, Groups I and II do not share a common technical feature, therefore; there is no special technical feature and thus the claims lack unity.

Applicant is required to elect a group to be examined on the merits.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not

Art Unit: 4133

distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) of the other invention.

Election of Species

Compound

3. If Applicant elects either Group I or II for examination, then a single disclosed specie is required for examination. Claim 1 is generic due to a plurality of the following disclosed patentably distinct species represented in claims 1-7. The compounds of claims 1-7 encompass many different and distinct compositions. The compositions vary distinctly in their structures and functions. Thus, an individual search is required of each individual composition. Therefore, Applicant is required to elect a specific compound, to which the elected invention will be examined on the merits as drawn to (in the event that the elected compound cannot be found, the elected structure will be opened to a reasonable core.); as well as identifying those claims to which the elected compound/invention is drawn.

Type of Cancer

4. If Applicant elects Group I for examination, then a single disclosed specie of cancer is ^{further} required for examination. Claims 8 and 15 are generic due to a plurality of the following disclosed patentably distinct cancer species represented in claim 15. The cancers in the instant specification in claim 15 vary distinctly symptomatically. For example, the symptoms associated with breast cancer (e.g. breast pain or lump within the breast) would vary distinctly from the symptoms associated with leukemia (e.g. fatigue, weakness, bruising, excess bleeding from minor cuts, etc.). Therefore, a subject that has one cancer like breast cancer would not necessarily have the other cancer like leukemia. Thus, an individual search is required of each individual distinct cancer. Applicant is required to elect a cancer from the list in the instant specification represented in claim 15, to which the elected invention will be examined on the merits as drawn to; as well as identifying those claims to which the elected compound/invention is drawn.

Type of Angiogenic Disorder

5. If Applicant elects Group II for examination, then a single disclosed specie of angiogenic disorder is ^{further} required for examination. Claims 22-23 and 29 are generic due to a plurality of the following disclosed patentably distinct species represented in claim 29. The disorders in the instant specification in claim 29 vary distinctly symptomatically. For example, the symptoms associated with acne (e.g. inflammation of the pilosebaceous units) would vary distinctly from the symptoms associated with Sturge-Weber syndrome

Art Unit: 4133

(e.g. neurological and skin disorder.). Therefore, a subject that has one disease/condition like acne would not necessarily have the other disease/condition like Sturge-Weber syndrome. Thus, an individual search is required of each individual distinct disorder, disease or medical condition. Applicant is required to elect a disorder/condition/disease from the list in the instant specification represented in claim 29, to which the elected invention will be examined on the merits as drawn to; as well as identifying those claims to which the elected compound/invention is drawn.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) of the other invention.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product

Art Unit: 4133

are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) of the other invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

7-. Effective November 1, 2007, if applicant wishes to present more than 5 independent claims or more than 25 total claims in an application, applicant will be required to file an examination support document (ESD) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 before the first Office action on the merits (hereafter "5/25 claim threshold"). See Changes to Practice for Continued Examination Filings, Patent Applications Containing Patentably Indistinct Claims, and Examination of Claims in Patent Applications, 72 Fed. Reg. 46715 (Aug. 21, 2007), 1322 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 76 (Sept. 11, 2007) (final rule). The changes to 37 CFR 1.75(b) apply to any pending applications in which a first Office action on the merits (FAOM) has not been mailed before November 1, 2007. Withdrawn claims will not be taken into account in determining whether an application exceeds the 5/25 claim threshold. For more information on the final rule, please see <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/presentation/clmcontfinalrule.html>.

In response to the restriction requirement set forth in this Office action, applicant is required to file an election responsive to the restriction requirement. Applicant may not file a suggested restriction requirement (SRR) in lieu of an election responsive to the restriction requirement as a reply. A SRR alone will not be considered a *bona-fide* reply to this Office action.

If applicant elects an invention that is drawn to no more than 5 independent claims and no more than 25 total claims, applicant will not be required to file an ESD in

Art Unit: 4133

compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 that covers each of the elected claims. If the elected invention is drawn to more than 5 independent claims or more than 25 total claims, applicant may file an amendment canceling a number of elected claims so that the elected invention would be drawn to no more than 5 independent claims and no more than 25 total claims.

If the restriction requirement is mailed on or after November 1, 2007, applicant is also required to file an ESD in compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 that covers each of the elected claims, unless the elected invention is drawn to no more than 5 independent claims and no more than 25 total claims taking into account any amendment to the claims. To avoid the abandonment of the application, the ESD (if required) and the election must be filed within **TWO MONTHS** from the mailing date of this Office action. The two-month time period for reply is extendable under 37 CFR 1.136.

If the restriction requirement is mailed before November 1, 2007, the election must be filed within **ONE MONTH** or THIRTY DAYS, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this Office action. The time period for reply is extendable under 37 CFR 1.136. Furthermore, if the elected invention is drawn to more than 5 independent claims or more than 25 total claims taking into account any amendment to the claims, the Office will notify applicant and provide a time period in which applicant is required to file an ESD in compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 covering each of the elected claims or amend

Art Unit: 4133

the application to contain no more than 5 independent elected claims and no more than 25 total elected claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph S. Kudla whose telephone number is (571) 270-3288. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Stucker can be reached on (571) 272-0911. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JK



10/29/07


ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER